

E-FILED 6/27/06

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

PING YAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL CHERTOFF, et al.,

Defendants.

Case Number C 06-03573 RS

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On June 5, 2006, plaintiff Ping Yan filed a “Complaint For Writ in the Nature of Mandamus” against defendants Michael Chertoff, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; Emilio T. Gonzalez, Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (“CIS”); Francis D. Siciliano, Officer-in charge of the San Jose Sub Office of the CIS; Robert S. Mueller III, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and Evelyn Upchurch Acting Director of the Nebraska Service Center of the CIS.

Plaintiff alleges defendants have failed to process her two “I-485, Application to Register Permanent Resident or Adjust Status” in a timely manner, apparently as a result of delays in processing a security check.

1 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have violated the Administrative Procedures Act, 5
2 U.S.C § 701 et. seq., by “withholding or unreasonably delaying action on the Plaintiff’s I-485
3 applications and [by] fail[ing] to carry out the adjudicative functions delegated to them by law.”
4 Plaintiff requests that this Court enter an order requiring defendants to complete the security
5 check and process the case to conclusion. Good cause therefore appearing, IT IS HEREBY
6 ORDERED as follows:

7 (1) The Clerk of the Court shall serve by certified mail a copy of the petition and a
8 copy of this Order upon counsel for Defendants, the Office of the United States Attorney.

9 (2) Defendants shall, within sixty (60) days after receiving service of the petition, file
10 and serve upon Plaintiff an answer, showing cause why the relief prayed for should not be
11 granted. At the time the answer is filed, Defendants shall lodge with the Court all records
12 relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the complaint. If Defendants contend that
13 Plaintiff has failed to exhaust administrative remedies as to any ground for relief asserted in the
14 complaint, Defendants shall specify what administrative remedy remains available to Plaintiff.
15 If Defendants waive or concede the issue of exhaustion, Defendants shall so state in their
16 answer.

17 (3) Plaintiff may file a response to the matters raised in the answer within thirty (30)
18 days after receiving the answer.

19 (4) Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, the matter will be deemed submitted upon
20 the filing of the response or upon the expiration of time to file a response.

21 (5) No later than the time their respective responses hereunder are due, the parties
22 shall make their determination regarding the issue of consent to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate
23 Judge and file the appropriate form. In the event any party declines to consent to the jurisdiction
24 of the Magistrate Judge, this action will be reassigned to a District Judge for further proceedings.
25
26
27
28

1 (6) The Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR deadlines entered
2 on June 5, 2006 in this action is hereby VACATED.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: June 27, 2006

5 
6 RICHARD SEEBORG
7 United States Magistrate Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT NOTICE OF THIS ORDER HAS BEEN DELIVERED**
2 **TO:**

3 Justin X. Wang lawbw@aol.com

4 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not
5 registered for e-filing under the Court's CM/ECF program.

6 **Dated: 6/27/06**

Chambers of Judge Richard Seeborg

7
8 **By:** /s/ BAK